	Case 2.05-cv-00376-RSL Docui	Tiefft 33 Filed 10/20/05 Page 1 0/2
01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
07	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
08	LUCIANO TONELLI,) CASE NO. C05-0376-RSL-MAT
09	Plaintiff,))
10	V.	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'SMOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
11	SARGENT AUTRY, et al.,	
12	Defendants.))
13		.)
14	Plaintiff is a Washington state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> in this civil rights action pursuant	
15	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment, which is noted for	
16	consideration on October 28, 2005. (Doc. #31). Plaintiff has filed a motion for extension of time	
17	to file a response to defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #32). As reasons for the	
18	extension of time, plaintiff cites delays in using the prison law library. (Id.) Having considered	
19	plaintiff's motion and the balance of the record, the court does hereby find and ORDER:	
20	(1) Plaintiff's motion for extension of time (Doc. #31) is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall	
21	file a response to defendants' motion for summary judgment no later than November 25, 2005 .	
22	Defendants may file a reply by December 2, 2005, the new noting date set forth below. In	
	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME PAGE -1	

preparing his response to defendants' motion, plaintiff is reminded of the following:

When a party you are suing makes a motion for summary judgment that is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot simply rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or authenticated documents, as provided in Rule 56(e), that contradict the facts shown in the defendant's declarations and documents and show that there is a genuine issue of material fact for trial. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition, summary judgment, if appropriate, may be entered against you. If summary judgment is granted, your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial.

Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 962-963 (9th Cir. 1998). Furthermore, plaintiff is reminded that he must serve a copy of the response on defendants and provide the court with a certificate showing such service, pursuant to Local Rule CR 5(f).

(2) The Clerk shall renote defendants' motion for summary judgment for consideration on December 2, 2005. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for defendants, and to the Honorable Robert S. Lasnik.

DATED this 20th day of October, 2005.

Mary Alice Theiler

United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME PAGE -2